For the Northern District of California

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EOD THE NODTHEDN DIS	TDICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	CHARLES O. BRADLEY TRUST, ET AL.,	
11	Plaintiffs,	No. C 04-02239 JSW
12	v.	
13	ZENITH CAPITAL LLC, ET AL.,	NOTICE OF TENTATIVE
14	Defendants.	RULING AND QUESTIONS REGARDING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE THIRD
15		AMENDED COMPLAINT
16		
17	/	
18		

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING **TENTATIVE** RULING AND QUESTIONS FOR THE HEARING SCHEDULED ON JANUARY 20, 2006 AT 9:00 A.M.:

The Court has reviewed the parties' papers and, thus, does not wish to hear the parties reargue matters addressed in those pleadings. If the parties intend to rely on authorities not cited in their briefs, they are ORDERED to notify the Court and opposing counsel of these authorities reasonably in advance of the hearing and to make copies available at the hearing. If the parties submit such additional authorities, they are ORDERED to submit the citations to the authorities only, without argument or additional briefing. See N.D. Civ. L.R. 7-3(d). The parties will be given the opportunity at oral argument to explain their reliance on such authority.

28

1	The Court tentatively GRANTS Plaintiffs' motion for leave to file a third ame	nded	
2	complaint.		
3	The parties shall each have ten minutes to address the following questions:		
4	1. In Defendants' opposition, they represent that there are "serious attemp	ts	
5 6	underway to resolve" the litigation, but in the joint case management st the parties represent that "settlement does not appear to be imminent." viable settlement amongst the parties to the current lawsuit and would t addition of new parties significantly endanger resolution of this action?	Is there a	
7	2. Defendants' opposition to the motion appears to argue that the facts do	not	
8	actually support the theories alleged under the proposed amended comp Why are these arguments not more properly the subject of a motion for judgment?	laint.	
9	3. Do the parties have anything further they wish to address?		
10			
11	Dated: January 17, 2006		
12	JEFFREY S. WHITE UNITED STATES DISTRICT	LIIDGE	
13	OMILD SIMILS DISTRICT	JODGE	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
	\mathbf{r}		